Reassessing Criminal Responsibility: A Criminological Perspective on Penal Agency, Behavioral Determinants, and Judicial Evaluation

Sergio Pommier Gallo, PhD
ORCID: 0009-0000-7387-3943
ORCID Profile: https://orcid.org/0009-0000-7387-3943
Web of Science ResearcherID: QDO-1840-2026
Web of Science Research Profile:
https://www.webofscience.com/wos/author/record/QDO-1840-2026
Academic Blog: https://sergiopommiergallophd.blogspot.com

Abstract

Criminal responsibility remains one of the fundamental concepts of criminal law, establishing the theoretical basis through which individuals are held accountable for unlawful conduct. Traditional legal approaches have primarily focused on individual capacity, intent, and awareness of legal norms as the essential elements of culpability. However, contemporary criminological and behavioral research demonstrates that criminal conduct is influenced by complex interactions between individual characteristics, psychological processes, social environments, and situational conditions.

This theoretical paper examines criminal responsibility from a criminological perspective, focusing on the relationship between penal agency, behavioral determinants, and judicial evaluation. It argues that a comprehensive understanding of criminal responsibility requires an interdisciplinary approach capable of integrating legal doctrine with empirical knowledge regarding human behavior.

The paper explores the limitations of purely normative approaches and analyzes how criminological perspectives contribute to a more complete assessment of culpability and accountability. By examining behavioral factors and institutional decision-making processes, this study proposes that criminal responsibility should be interpreted within a broader framework that recognizes both individual agency and contextual influences.

Keywords: criminal responsibility; criminology; penal agency; culpability; behavioral determinants; criminal law; judicial evaluation.

---

1. Introduction

Criminal responsibility constitutes the foundation upon which modern criminal justice systems determine accountability and justify punishment. The attribution of responsibility requires an assessment of whether an individual possessed the necessary capacity to understand, evaluate, and control their conduct.

Classical criminal law has developed sophisticated doctrines concerning culpability, intent, negligence, and capacity. These doctrines provide essential safeguards against arbitrary punishment by establishing that criminal sanctions should only apply when personal responsibility can be demonstrated.

However, the complexity of human behavior presents significant challenges for traditional approaches. Criminological research has consistently demonstrated that criminal conduct cannot be explained exclusively through individual choice or isolated decision-making. Instead, behavior emerges through interactions between psychological characteristics, social experiences, environmental conditions, and situational influences.

The relationship between criminal responsibility and behavioral science therefore represents a central issue in contemporary criminology and criminal law. Understanding criminal conduct requires maintaining the principle of individual accountability while incorporating empirical knowledge regarding human behavior.

This paper examines criminal responsibility through a criminological perspective, analyzing the relationship between penal agency, behavioral determinants, and judicial evaluation.

---

2. Criminal Responsibility and the Foundations of Penal Accountability

The concept of criminal responsibility is traditionally associated with the principle of culpability. Criminal law systems generally require that an individual possess both the physical capacity to commit an act and the mental state necessary to justify attribution of blame.

The doctrine of *mens rea* reflects this principle by distinguishing between intentional, reckless, negligent, and accidental conduct. Through this distinction, criminal law attempts to ensure proportionality between individual behavior and legal consequences.

Nevertheless, responsibility attribution involves complex evaluations regarding human cognition, intention, and behavioral control. These evaluations cannot be separated completely from knowledge about psychological and social processes.

A criminological perspective does not replace legal analysis but expands understanding of the factors involved in criminal behavior.

---

3. Penal Agency and Human Behavior

Penal agency refers to the individual's capacity to act intentionally and meaningfully within the boundaries established by law.

Traditional legal models frequently conceptualize agency as a relatively stable characteristic. However, behavioral sciences demonstrate that decision-making is influenced by multiple factors, including cognitive processes, emotional regulation, previous experiences, and social conditions.

Individuals do not make decisions in complete isolation. Human behavior develops through continuous interaction between personal characteristics and external environments.

Therefore, the analysis of criminal responsibility requires consideration of how agency operates within specific behavioral and social contexts.

---

4. Behavioral Determinants of Criminal Conduct

Criminology has developed multiple theoretical approaches explaining the emergence of criminal behavior.

Social learning perspectives emphasize the role of acquired behaviors, reinforcement processes, and interaction with criminal environments. Control theories examine the relationship between social bonds and behavioral regulation. Developmental criminology analyzes how criminal trajectories may evolve across different life stages.

These approaches demonstrate that criminal conduct is influenced by accumulated experiences rather than only immediate decisions.

Behavioral determinants do not eliminate personal responsibility. Instead, they provide a more precise understanding of the mechanisms through which individuals engage in unlawful behavior.

---

5. Judicial Evaluation of Criminal Responsibility

Judicial evaluation represents the institutional process through which legal systems determine responsibility. Although judicial decisions are based on legal rules and evidence, they also involve interpretation of human behavior.

Courts evaluate intention, credibility, motivation, risk, and circumstances surrounding criminal conduct. These assessments require judgments about individual agency and behavioral capacity.

The integration of criminological knowledge may contribute to more accurate evaluations by providing a broader understanding of behavioral patterns and contextual influences.

However, judicial assessment must preserve the fundamental principles of legality, due process, and proportionality.

---

6. The Relationship Between Criminology and Criminal Law

Criminal law and criminology address different dimensions of crime. Criminal law establishes normative criteria for responsibility, while criminology examines the causes, patterns, and consequences of criminal behavior.

The interaction between these disciplines provides a more comprehensive framework for understanding criminal responsibility.

An exclusively legal approach may overlook relevant behavioral information. Conversely, an exclusively criminological approach cannot replace normative judgments regarding accountability.

The challenge of contemporary criminal justice is therefore developing interdisciplinary approaches that respect both scientific evidence and legal principles.

---

7. Discussion

The analysis of criminal responsibility requires recognition that human behavior is simultaneously individual and contextual.

Legal systems must preserve accountability because responsibility represents a fundamental principle of justice. However, accountability becomes more accurate when informed by criminological and behavioral research.

A scientifically informed understanding of criminal responsibility does not weaken criminal law. Rather, it strengthens the legitimacy of legal decisions by improving the assessment of human conduct.

Future developments in criminal justice should continue promoting interdisciplinary dialogue between criminology, psychology, and legal theory.

---

8. Conclusion

Criminal responsibility remains a central concept in criminal justice, but its interpretation requires continuous theoretical refinement.

A criminological perspective demonstrates that penal agency and criminal conduct are influenced by multiple behavioral and contextual factors. Integrating this knowledge into criminal responsibility analysis allows a more complete understanding of culpability while maintaining the essential principles of criminal law.

The future of criminal justice depends on the ability to combine normative legal frameworks with scientific knowledge regarding human behavior.

References

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social Foundations of Thought and Action: A Social Cognitive Theory.* Prentice-Hall.

Beccaria, C. (1764). *On Crimes and Punishments.*

Duff, R. A. (2001). *Punishment, Communication, and Community.* Oxford University Press.

Garland, D. (2001). *The Culture of Control: Crime and Social Order in Contemporary Society.* Oxford University Press.

Gottfredson, M. R., & Hirschi, T. (1990). *A General Theory of Crime.* Stanford University Press.

Hart, H. L. A. (1968). *Punishment and Responsibility: Essays in the Philosophy of Law.* Oxford University Press.

Hirschi, T. (1969). *Causes of Delinquency.* University of California Press.

Paternoster, R., & Mazerolle, P. (1994). General strain theory and delinquency: A replication and extension. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency.*

Zimbardo, P. G. (2007). *The Lucifer Effect: Understanding How Good People Turn Evil.* Random House.